

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/242,215

Applicant(s)

McAnalley et al..

Examiner

Michele Flood

Group Art Unit

1651

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michele Flood(3) Bill McAnalley(2) Randall C. Brown(4) Eileen VennumDate of Interview Oct 12, 2001Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: All in detail, especially Claims 1 and 22.

Identification of prior art discussed:

JP 57007420 and JP 59112922.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Proposed draft of amended Claim 1 is responsive. Discussed amending Claim 22 to more particularly and fully define the instantly claimed composition.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.